

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,539 07/16/2003		07/16/2003	H. William Bosch	029318-0961	6324	
31049	7590	08/30/2006		EXAMINER		
ELAN DRUG DELIVERY, INC. C/O FOLEY & LARDNER LLP				KATAKAM, S	KATAKAM, SUDHAKAR	
3000 K STR	EET, N.V	V	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SUITE 500			1621			
WASHING	ION, DC	20007-5109	DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)						
Office Action Summary			39	BOSCH ET AL.						
			7	Art Unit						
		Sudhakar	Katakam	1621						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply	cation appears on th	e cover sheet wit	th the correspondence ac	idress					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA Isions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu- period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply we eply received by the Office later than three months afted and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THE AIL TO THE AIL TO THE AIL TO THE AIL TO THE AIL THE	HIS COMMUNIC ent, however, may a re ill expire SIX (6) MONT flication to become AB/	CATION. Sply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this can ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status										
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	ion .								
·	•	b)⊠ This action is r	on-final.							
· —	Since this application is in condition f	•		ers, prosecution as to the	e merits is					
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims									
4)	4) Claim(s) 1-123 is/are pending in the application.									
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.									
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.									
8)□	Claim(s) 1-123 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.									
Applicati	on Papers		•							
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.								
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.										
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:										
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.									
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 									
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.										
			·							
Attachmen			_							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date							
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F r No(s)/Mail Date			formal Patent Application (PT	O-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/619,539 Page 2

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-45, drawn to a stable nanoparticulate liquid dosage composition,
 classified in class 424, subclass 489 for example.
 - II. Claims 46-75, drawn to a method of making a stable nanoparticulate liquid dosage composition, classified in class 514, subclass 1+ for example.
 - III. Claims 76-123, drawn to a method of treating a subject with a stable nanoparticulate liquid dosage composition, classified in class 514, subclass 946 for example.
- 2. The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process, for example, US patent No. 5,145,684 teaches a nanoparticulate active agent formulation. The instant formulation can be made by the process taught in said reference.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,539

Art Unit: 1621

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case method of treating can also be achieved by materially different product. For example, US patent No. 5,145,684 teaches the process of using the composition can be done using the composition taught in the reference.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). While the two groups may be related in that the both recite the composition of group I, group II and III are drawn to two statutory classes of invention; one to a method of using a product. The other to a method of making a product.

- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

 Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,539

Art Unit: 1621

All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/619,539 Page 5

Art Unit: 1621

6. A telephone call was made to Michele M. Simkin on 8/25/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sudhakar Katakam whose telephone number is 571-272-9929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SIKARL A. WITHERSPOON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

SK